

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.         | FILING DATE                    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 09/933,892              | 08/21/2001                     | Ismo Itkonen         | 100720-00050 (HEIN<br>18.938 | 6369             |
| 26304                   | 7590 03/18/2005                | EXAM                 | EXAMINER                     |                  |
|                         | IUCHIN ZAVIS ROSI<br>ON AVENUE | LOPEZ, M             | ICHELLE                      |                  |
| NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585 |                                |                      | ART UNIT                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                         |                                |                      | 3721                         | -                |

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | 1             |
|---|---------------|
| Y | $\mathcal{D}$ |

|  |   | Application No.                     | Applicant(s)                 |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary  |   | 09/933,892                          | ITKONEN ET AL.               |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | Examiner                            | Art Unit                     |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | Michelle Lopez                      | 3721                         |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply   |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |   | ·                                   |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 1)⊠  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 S  | September 2004.                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 2a)□   | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This   | 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.      |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 3)□  | Since this application is in condition for allowa   | nce except for formal matters, pro  | secution as to the merits is |  |  |  |  |
|  | closed in accordance with the practice under be   | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45   | 53 O.G. 213.                 |  |  |  |  |
| Disposit   | ion of Claims   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 4)🖂  | Claim(s) 1-6 and 20-24 is/are pending in the a  | pplication.                         |                              |  |  |  |  |
| ,  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra  |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 5)□  | Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| •  | Claim(s) <u>1-6, 20-24</u> is/are rejected.   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| -  | Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 8)   | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o   | or election requirement.            |                              |  |  |  |  |
| Applicat   | ion Papers  |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| . 9)   | The specification is objected to by the Examine   | er.                                 |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 10)  | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc  | cepted or b) objected to by the I   | Examiner.                    |  |  |  |  |
|  | Applicant may not request that any objection to the   | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).            |  |  |  |  |
|  | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct  | •                                   |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 11)  | The oath or declaration is objected to by the E   | xaminer. Note the attached Office   | Action or form PTO-152.      |  |  |  |  |
| Priority (   | under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:   |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>   |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No   |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies flot received.  |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date   |   |                                     |                              |  |  |  |  |
| 3) 🛛 Infor   | ee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)<br>mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>er No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/3/05</u> . |                                     | Patent Application (PTO-152) |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 09/933,892 Page 2

Art Unit: 3721

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

- 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 15, 2004 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 7-19 have been canceled.
- 3. New claims 22-24 have been added.

## Claim Objections

4. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claim 23, on page 4, been renumbered 24.

Application/Control Number: 09/933,892 Page 3

Art Unit: 3721

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-5, 21-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Crowell (603,585).

Crowell discloses a method for packaging rolls comprising the steps of providing a wrapper dispensing system for dispensing wrapping onto a roll of web material, said wrapper dispensing system comprising a wrapper dispensing station 120 and a wrapper dispensing means y; supporting a roll 100 of web material on a roll rotation station 101; rotating said roll rotation station with said roll of web material supported thereon (see col. 1; 38-43), said wrapper dispensing system remaining stationary relative to said rotating supported roll; dispensing wrapping onto the rotating supported roll from said wrapper dispensing station via said dispensing means so that a first wrapping is wound so as to form on said rotating supported roll; relative lo the wrapper dispensing system after dispensing said first wrapping as shown in col.3; 23-27; and dispensing wrapping onto the rotating supported roll from said wrapper dispensing station via said dispensing means after the moving step so that a second wrapping is wound so as to form on said rotating supported roll, said second wrapping being formed to overlap said first wrapping in a stagewise manner (see col. 1; 10-27).

With respect to claim 2, Crowell discloses wherein each of said first and second wrapping is wound in slightly helical manner onto the roll as shown in col. 1; 22-27.

With respect to claim 3, Crowell discloses wherein layers of wound wrapping have sharp edges that are aligned partially or entirely overlapping so that a staggered stepped bond can be formed therebetween as shown in col. 1; 18-22.

With respect to claim 4, Crowell discloses wherein the slightly helical manner by which the wrapping is wound is performed by the movement of the roll rotation station laterally relative to the wrapper dispensing system during the wrapping dispensing operation as shown in col. 1; 10-22.

With respect to claim 5, Crowell discloses wherein the wrapping is aligned in a slightly helical position in regard to the roll rotation station as shown in Fig. 1.

With respect to claim 21, Crowell discloses wherein each of said first and second wrapping is wound in a slightly helical manner onto the roll, and said second wrapping is wound as a stagewise overlapping wrapping of said first wrapping.

With respect to claim 22, Crowell inherently discloses wherein said moving and dispensing steps are repeated so that at least a third overlapping wrapping is wound as a stagewise overlapping wrapping of said first wrapping.

As far as claim 24 was understood, since Crowell discloses a wrapper being wound spirally about papers being longitudinally advanced and edges of successive layers or windings of wrapper overlapping, it is deemed that first and second wrappings are disposed in a staggered fashion wherein only a single overlapping wrapper edge of said second wrapping superposed over said first wrapping is visible when said second wrapping has been completed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowell (603,585) in view of Pienta et al. (6,186,326).

Crowell discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the process step of wrapping a plastic wrap in a helical manner onto the rotating supported roll, wherein said plastic wrap being dispensed form a wrapper wrap dispenser incorporated into the wrapper dispensing system.

However, Pienta teaches the process the process step of wrapping a plastic wrap 116 onto the roll after the dispensing step, wherein the plastic wrap dispenser is incorporated into the wrapper dispensing system in conjunction with the web wrapper for the purpose of providing a protective layer to the wrapped roll eliminating the process steps of handling the wrapped rolls from a first wrapping machine to a second wrapping machine and at the same time reducing the production cycle time (see col. 1; 1-18, and col. 5; 39-41).

In view of Pienta, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided Crowell's invention including the process step of wrapping a plastic wrap performed in the same wrapping station in conjunction with the web wrapper in order to provide a protective plastic layer to a wrapped roll eliminating the process step of handling the wrapped rolls from a first wrapping machine to a second wrapping machine.

7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowell (603,585).

Crowell discloses wherein the roll of web material is formed from paper, i.e. newspaper, but Crowell does not disclose that the wrapper is formed from paper.

However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have provide a paper wrapper, since applicant has not disclosed that a paper wrapper is for any particular purpose and it appears that Crowell's invention would perform equally well with a paper wrapper for the purpose of dispensing wrapping onto a roll.

### Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Putnam'865 is cited to show related inventions.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Lopez whose telephone number is 571-272-4464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thursday: 8:00 am 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/933,892 Page 7

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rinaldi I. Rada Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3700